

SOLAR-LIKE CYCLE IN ASYMPTOTIC GIANT BRANCH STARS

Noam Soker

Department of Physics, University of Haifa at Oranim
Oranim, Tivon 36006, ISRAEL
soker@physics.technion.ac.il

ABSTRACT

I propose that the mechanism behind the formation of concentric semi-periodic shells found in several planetary nebulae (PNs) and proto-PNs, and around one asymptotic giant branch (AGB) star, is a solar-like magnetic activity cycle in the progenitor AGB stars. The time intervals between consecutive ejection events is $\sim 200 - 1,000$ yrs, which is assumed to be the cycle period (the full magnetic cycle can be twice as long, as is the 22-year period in the sun). The magnetic field has no dynamical effects; it regulates the mass loss rate by the formation of magnetic cool spots. The enhanced magnetic activity at the cycle maximum results in more magnetic cool spots, which facilitate the formation of dust, hence increasing the mass loss rate. The strong magnetic activity implies that the AGB star is spun up by a companion, via a tidal or common envelope interaction. The strong interaction with a stellar companion explains the observations that the concentric semi-periodic shells are found mainly in bipolar PNs.

Subject heading: Planetary nebulae: general – stars: AGB and post-AGB – stars: mass loss – stars: magnetic fields – circumstellar matter

1. INTRODUCTION

Concentric semi-periodic shells (also termed arcs or rings) appear in the images of several asymptotic giant branch (AGB) stars, proto-planetary nebulae (PNs) and young planetary nebulae (PNs). PNs and proto-PNs known to possess such shells are CRL 2688 (the “Egg” nebula; Sahai *et al.* 1998); IRAS 17150-3224 (Kwok, Su, & Hrivnak 1998); IRAS 17441-2411 (Su *et al.* 1998); Roberts 22 (although the shells are not really circular; Sahai *et al.* 1999); NGC 7027 and NGC 6543 (Bond 2000); and HB5. Presently the only AGB star known to possess shells is IRC+10216 (Mauron & Huggins 1999).

The main properties of the shells are (1) they are semi-periodic with time intervals between consecutive ejection events of $\sim 200 - 1,000$ yrs. (2) They are spherical or almost spherical. However, low degree of departures from sphericity is seen in some shells, e.g., in the Egg nebula (Sahai *et al.* 1998). (3) They can be almost complete, i.e., appear as rings, or incomplete, where only a fraction of a full circle is observed, i.e., they appear as arcs. (4) The shells’ density enhancement relative to the inter-shell density is by a factor of a few up to a factor of ~ 10 (Mauron & Huggins 1999). (5) The centers of all shells in a given object coincide with the central star to within a few percent of their size. (6) *All* PNs and proto-PNs which possess concentric shells are bipolar, i.e., have two lobes with an equatorial waist between them (e.g., IRAS 17150-3224), or they are extreme ellipticals (NGC 6543). By extreme elliptical PNs I refer to PNs having strong concentration of mass toward the equatorial plane, e.g., a torus (ring). Although there might be a selection effect in detecting the shells in bipolar PNs, since the central star is more attenuated (R. Sahai, private communication), I do not think this alone can explain the observations.

In the present paper I propose that these shells are produced by a solar-like cycle in the progenitor AGB stars. The enhanced magnetic activity at the cycle maximum results in more magnetic cool spots, which facilitate the formation of dust, hence increasing the mass loss rate (Soker 2000). In §2 I review the previous mechanisms proposed for the formation of these shells, and argue that none of these can account for all properties of these shells. I then outline the main ingredient of the magnetic activity cycle mechanism. In §3 I examine some of the properties of a plausible mechanism that may amplify the magnetic field in upper AGB stars. My summary is in §4.

2. SUPPORT AND CONSTRAINTS FROM OBSERVATIONS

2.1. Previously Proposed Mechanisms

A discussion of several possible mechanisms for the formation of concentric semi-periodic shells is given by Sahai *et al.* (1998) and Bond (2000). Here I extend these discussions and examine each

of the previously proposed models.

Helium-shell flashes (thermal pulses). Any mechanism based on helium-shell flashes is ruled out because the typical inter-flash period is $\gtrsim 10^4$ yrs (Sahai *et al.* 1998; Kwok *et al.* 1998).

Instability in the dust+gas outflow. The instability in the gas-dust coupling in the outflowing material was suggested as a mechanism for the formation of the shells in the Egg nebula by Deguchi (1997). This model cannot explain the formation of shells for a few reasons. First, from the results of Morris (1992) it seems that in most cases the time interval between consecutive shells predicted by this mechanism is too short. Second, the shells will be smoothed out within a short distance from the star (Mastrodemos, Morris & Castor 1996). Third, the instability in the gas-dust coupling is a local instability. Therefore, it will form small-scale instability and short arcs, but will not form an almost complete shell (e.g., NGC 6543).

Chaos. Icke, Frank & Heske (1992) examined the response of the outer layers of an evolved AGB star to the oscillatory motion of an instability zone in the stellar interior. They found that for the right initial conditions and parameters, the stellar surface shows multiperiodicity or chaotic behaviors, in addition to the regular oscillations. I find some problems with this mechanism. Qualitatively, the chaotic or multiperiodicity found by Icke *et al.* (1992) do not have the correct behavior (the two lower panels of their fig. 11). There is no real semi-periodic behavior, but rather the time intervals between two consecutive high amplitudes episodes differ a lot from one interval to another. This behavior cannot account for the regularly spaced arcs in, e.g., IRAS 17150-3224 (Kwok *et al.* 1998). In some cases the duration of the maximum phase is longer than the duration of the low amplitude intervals. This is not the observed properties of the concentric shells in most of the objects listed in the previous section. In the lower two panels of their figure 11 (panels 7 and 8), the maximum time interval between two consecutive maximum phases is only ~ 16 times as long as the regular oscillation period. This time interval is an order of magnitude shorter than the observed time intervals. In panels 5 and 6 of their figure 11 the maximum phase lasts several hundred years. However, they do not show more than one maximum phase, so I can not comment on the long term behavior of these cases.

A binary companion in an eccentric orbit. In this mechanism, which was proposed by Harpaz, Rappaport & Soker (1997), a periastron passage of a stellar companion in an eccentric orbit modulates the mass loss rate and/or geometry. The periodic, on a time scale of several $\times 100$ yrs, periastron passage can increase, or decrease by diverting the flow, the mass loss rate, leading to the formation of rings by these periodic modulations. Sahai *et al.* (1998) criticized this mechanism on the ground that it predicts exact circular shells with regular spacing between them, properties which are not observed in the Egg nebula. There is another reason to reject this mechanism for the formation of the shells. The eccentric orbit mechanism predicts that the center of the shells will be displaced from the central star (Soker, Rappaport, & Harpaz 1998). Such a displacement is not observed.

A close binary companion. Mastrodemos & Morris (1999) show in their numerical simulations that the presence of a close companion, orbital separation of $\lesssim \text{several} \times 10$ AU leads to the formation of a spiral structure in the equatorial plane. When viewed at a large angle to the symmetry

(rotation) axis, the circumstellar matter should show regularly spaced half-rings on each side of the symmetry axis. I find this model unsatisfactory since it predicts on-off locations for the half-shells near the symmetry axis. That is, the dense rings on one side of the symmetry axis will be at radial distances which correspond to the inter-ring spaces on the other side. This is not observed. In addition, the arguments listed by Sahai *et al.* (1998) against the eccentric binary mechanism hold for this mechanism as well.

Giant convection cells. Sahai *et al.* (1998) present the idea that large cool convection cells form the concentric semi-periodic shells. Such giant cool convection cells make dust formation more efficient, hence increasing the mass loss rate. I see two problems. First, giant convection cells are expected to appear in specific location on the surface, so it is not clear they can form an almost complete shell. Second, the time scale of several hundred years is much too long for a life time of even a large convection cell in AGB stars.

To summarize, all the mechanisms listed above are expected to have some signatures on some nebulae formed from AGB stars, but none of them can explain the concentric semi-periodic shells.

2.2. The Proposed Magnetic Cycle Mechanism

I conjecture that the mechanism behind the formation of the concentric semi-periodic shells is a solar-like magnetic activity cycle. Below I list the observations in support of the proposed mechanism, the basic processes of the mechanism, and the implications of this conjecture. In the next section I will elaborate on plausible dynamo processes to amplify the magnetic field.

2.2.1. Supporting Observations

1) *Magnetic fields in AGB stars.* Kemball & Diamond (1997) detected a magnetic field in the extended atmosphere of the Mira variable TX Cam. Kemball & Diamond find the intensity of the magnetic field in the locations of SiO maser emission, at a radius of $4.8 \text{ AU} \simeq 2R_*$, to be $B \lesssim 5G$. The detection of X-ray emission from a few M giants (Hünsch *et al.* 1998) also hints at the presence of magnetic fields in giant stars.

2) *Solar cycle.* From the solar cycle we know that magnetic activity can be semi-periodic, and possess a global pattern, i.e., the cycle affects the entire solar surface.

3) *Inhomogeneity.* We also know from the solar magnetic activity that the magnetic spots cover only a fraction of the solar surface. This inhomogeneity can explain incomplete shells and the inhomogeneity observed in many shells, e.g., in the Egg nebula.

4) *Spot distribution with latitude.* From the Maunder’s butterfly diagram, e.g., for the years 1954-1977 (Priest 1987), there is evidence that the spots’ distribution is most uniform when the number

of spots is at maximum, and the spots reach the highest latitude during this cycle maximum. At that phase the spots are distributed almost uniformly from close to the equator up to a latitude θ_m . Spots do not distribute from the equator to θ_m in other phases of the solar cycle; at the beginning of a cycle they are concentrated in two annular regions around latitudes $\sim \pm 30^\circ < \theta_m$, while toward the end of a cycle they are near the equator. Moreover, from the two solar cycles in these years it turns out that θ_m is larger when the maximum total number of spots is larger. This hints that for a very strong magnetic activity, i.e., when there are many spots, as I speculate is the case for the AGB progenitors of the concentric semi-periodic shells, the spots are distributed uniformly, up to the inhomogeneity discussed above, over the entire stellar surface.

2.2.2. Basic Processes

The processes by which magnetic activity regulates the mass loss rate from AGB stars are studied in earlier papers (Soker 1998, 2000; Soker & Clayton 1999). As in the sun, it is assumed that the magnetic activity leads to the formation of magnetic cool spots, which facilitate the formation of dust. Since the mass loss mechanism from AGB stars is radiation pressure on dust, higher magnetic activity leads to enhanced mass loss rate. The goal in the earlier papers was to explain the transition from spherical to axisymmetrical mass loss in the AGB progenitors of elliptical PNs. The idea is that the increase in the magnetic activity (Soker & Harpaz 2000) and/or the increase in the mass loss rate (Soker 2000) which occur as the star is about to leave the AGB, increase the mass loss rate in the equatorial plane more than they do in the polar directions. This is based on the assumption, following the behavior of the sun, that the dynamo magnetic activity results in the formation of more magnetic cool spots near the equatorial plane than near the poles. Since that mechanism for axisymmetrical mass loss is intended to explain the formation of elliptical PNs, it is also assumed that the progenitors of elliptical PNs are slow rotators (Soker 2000), having angular velocities in the range of $3 \times 10^{-5} \omega_{\text{Kep}} \lesssim \omega \lesssim 10^{-2} \omega_{\text{Kep}}$, where ω_{Kep} is the equatorial Keplerian angular velocity. Such angular velocities could be gained from a planet companion of mass $\gtrsim 0.1 M_{\text{Jupiter}}$, which deposits its orbital angular momentum to the envelope, or even from single stars which are fast rotators on the main sequence.

In the present case, the AGB stars are progenitors of bipolar PNs or extreme ellipticals. In the binary model for the formation of bipolar PNs most of the AGB progenitors are tidally spun-up by close companions (Soker & Rappaport 2000), while the extreme elliptical PNs may be formed through a common envelope interaction (Soker 1997). In both cases we expect the AGB star to rotate with angular velocity of

$$0.01 \omega_{\text{Kep}} \lesssim \omega \lesssim 0.1 \omega_{\text{Kep}}, \quad (1)$$

which is more than the value of $\omega/\omega_{\text{Kep}}$ in the sun. We expect strong magnetic activity since the convection motion is very strong in these stars (next section). The upper limit on the angular

velocity means that dynamical effects will not much influence the mass loss geometry, since the centrifugal forces are negligible.

2.2.3. Implications

For the proposed mechanism to explain the spherical shape of the shells, whether complete or not, the following are implied.

1) *Spherical magnetic activity.* The average concentration of magnetic cool spots should be uniform on the stellar surface, although at any given moment the number of spots can be non-uniform, leading to the small-scale nonuniformity of the concentric semi-periodic shells. We note that the mass loss rate during the formation of the inter shells medium is not very high (the shells and the inter shells form a faint halo). It seems that large cool spots are required to regulate the mass loss rate when the mass loss rate is low (Frank 1995; Soker 2000). This means that only the medium to large cool magnetic spots are required to be distributed uniformly, but not the small spots. Only when mass loss gets to be very high (for detail see Soker 2000), as expected close to the termination of the AGB, do small cool spots facilitate the formation of dust as well.

2) *No other mechanisms.* The role of any other mechanism that causes departure from spherical mass loss should be very small, e.g., nonradial pulsations. This implies that any detached binary companion cannot be too close, i.e., no Roche lobe overflow, and that the AGB star cannot rotate at $\omega \gtrsim 0.1\omega_{\text{Kep}}$. This is indeed the case in most progenitors of bipolar PNs, as discussed in §2.2.2 above. The requirement that the companion spins up the mass losing star, but have only a minor dynamical influence on the mass loss process, puts severe constraints on the the binary properties. Mainly, the companion should not form an accretion disk and blow a collimated fast wind (CFW) or jets when the shells are formed. This implies that the companion is likely to be a main sequence star of mass $0.1 \lesssim M_2 \lesssim 0.5M_{\odot}$, (for the conditions for the formation of a CFW see Soker & Rappaport 2000). Only during the superwind phase, when mass loss rate is very high, does the companion manage to blow a CFW, leading to the formation of a bipolar PN (Soker & Rappaport 2000). The constraints on the companion mass, of $\sim 0.3M_{\odot}$, and on the orbital separation, of $a \sim 5 - 30AU$, explain why many bipolar PNs and proto-PNs do not have concentric semi-periodic shells.

3. THE DYNAMO IN AGB STARS

Dynamo generation of magnetic fields in evolved AGB stars has two major differences from the dynamo in main sequence stars, e.g., the sun. First the mass loss rate is very high, so that the mass leaving the star drags the magnetic field lines, rather than being dragged by the magnetic field lines.

Second, the dynamo number is $N_D \ll 1$, whereas in main sequence stars $N_D > 1$, as is required by standard $\alpha\omega$ dynamo models. The dynamo number is the square of the ratio of the magnetic field amplification rate in the $\alpha\omega$ dynamo model, to the ohmic decay rate. A third difference from the situation in the sun, but not from all main sequence stars, is that in AGB stars the convective region is very thick, whereas in the sun its width is only $0.3R_\odot$. The aim of this section is to point to possible effects which these differences may have on the amplification of the magnetic field, and not to develop a new dynamo mechanism. Future more complete calculations should examine the exact conditions and mechanism(s) for the generation of magnetic fields in AGB stars.

3.1. Effects Due to a High Mass Loss Rate

In the sun, as in most main sequence stars, the mass loss rate is determined mainly by the magnetic activity. The magnetic pressure $P_B = B^2/(8\pi)$ on the stellar surface is no less than the ram pressure of the wind $P_w = \rho v_w^2$, where $\rho = \dot{M}_w/(4\pi R^2 v_w)$ is the density, v_w is the wind velocity, R is the stellar radius, and $\dot{M}_w$ is the mass loss rate to the wind, defined positively. Substituting typical values for the sun we find $P_B \simeq 0.1(B/2 \text{ G})^2 \text{ erg cm}^{-3}$ and $P_w \simeq 10^{-3} \text{ erg cm}^{-3}$, hence $P_B/P_w \simeq 100$. The relative magnetic activity required to dictate the mass loss geometry from AGB stars via the enhanced dust formation above magnetic cool spots is much weaker, and can be as low as $P_B/P_w \simeq 10^{-4}$ (eq. 11 of Soker 1998). Therefore, while in main sequence stars the magnetic field drags the wind close to the stellar surface, in AGB stars the wind drags the magnetic field lines. Assuming that the wind conserves angular momentum, its angular velocity decreases as $(R/r)^2$, where r is the distance of a parcel of gas from the center of the star. Hence near the surface

$$\left(\frac{d\omega}{dr}\right)_{\text{surface}} = -\frac{2\omega}{R}. \quad (2)$$

Note that in the solar interior the differential rotation is weaker $|d\omega/dr| \lesssim \omega_\odot/R_\odot$ (Tomczyk, Schou, & Thompson 1995; Charbonneau *et al.* 1998). Even if on the surface of AGB stars the shear is lower than the shear in the inner boundary of the convection region, it occurs on a much larger area, since the inner boundary of AGB convective regions is at several $\times R_\odot$.

Although the angular velocity shear is similar at the equator and poles, the winding of the field lines will be much stronger near the equator. Winding will be at large angles only when the wind is not much faster than the rotation velocity near the equator. This is indeed the case for the AGB stars considered in this paper, for which the angular velocity is according to equation (1). For a $1M_\odot$ AGB star with a stellar radius of $R = 2 \text{ AU}$, equation (1) gives for the rotation velocity on the equator $0.2 \text{ km s}^{-1} \lesssim v_{\text{eq}} \lesssim 2 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The distance along which the wind from upper AGB stars is accelerated is $\sim R$, and therefore within this distance from the surface the wind velocity is $< 10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, with a much lower velocity just above the surface: $v_{ws} \ll 10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The magnetic

field lines on the surface will be inclined in the azimuthal direction at an angle α to the radial direction, which depends on the latitude θ ($\theta = 0$ at the equator) according to

$$\tan \alpha(\theta) = (v_{eq}/v_{ws}) \cos \theta. \quad (3)$$

The conclusion from this subsection is that the amplification of the magnetic field at the AGB stellar surface, i.e., the outer boundary of the convection region, may be more significant than at the inner boundary of the convection regions of AGB stars.

3.2. Small Dynamo Number

In the $\alpha\omega$ stellar dynamo mechanism the α effect, due to convection, generates the poloidal component of the magnetic field, while differential rotation generates the toroidal component (e.g., Priest 1987 and references therein). Theory predicts that this mechanism operates efficiently only when the dynamo number (which is the square of the ratio of the magnetic field amplification rate to the ohmic decay rate of the magnetic field) is $N_D > 1$. When comparing with observations it is convenient to use the Rossby number (Noyes *et al.* 1984; Saar & Brandenburg 1999). The Rossby number is proportional to the ratio of the rotational period, $P_{\text{rot}} = 2\pi/\omega$, to the convective overturn time τ_c . Following Noyes *et al.* (1984) I take $\tau_c = 2l_p/v_c$, where l_p is the pressure scale height and v_c is the convective velocity, hence $\text{Ro} \equiv (\omega\tau_c)^{-1} = P_{\text{rot}}v_c/(4\pi l_p)$. Noyes *et al.* (1984) based their use of the Rossby number on the crude approximate relation $N_d \sim \text{Ro}^{-2}$. For main sequence stars having magnetic activity $\text{Ro} \lesssim 0.25$ (Saar & Brandenburg 1999), and hence $N_D > 1$ as required for the $\alpha\omega$ dynamo mechanism. For the sun $\text{Ro}_{\odot} = 0.16$, while the values of the Rossby number for the superactive stars in the sample used by Saar & Brandenburg (1999) are in the range $5 \times 10^{-5} \lesssim \text{Ro} \lesssim 10^{-2}$. Because of the strong convection in the envelope of AGB stars we find that $\text{Ro}(\text{AGB}) \gg 1$. Using typical values for AGB stars (e.g., figs 1-5 of Soker & Harpaz 2000; note that the density in their figs. 1-5 is lower by a factor of 10; the correct density scale is in their fig. 6), we find the Rossby number to be

$$\text{Ro}(\text{AGB}) = 9 \left(\frac{v_c}{10 \text{ km s}^{-1}} \right) \left(\frac{l_p}{40 R_{\odot}} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\omega}{0.1 \omega_{\text{Kep}}} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{P_{\text{Kep}}}{1 \text{ yr}} \right), \quad (4)$$

where P_{Kep} is the orbital period of a test particle moving in a Keplerian orbit along the equator of the star. The low value of the dynamo number, $N_D \sim \text{Ro}^{-2} \ll 1$, suggests that the convective motion amplifies both the poloidal and toroidal magnetic components, but that the differential rotation, both inside the envelope and on the surface (see previous subsection), still plays a nonnegligible role. Hydrodynamic turbulence can amplify magnetic fields, although not as efficiently as the $\alpha\omega$ dynamo (see, e.g., Goldman & Rephaeli 1991, and references therein, for the amplification of magnetic fields in clusters of galaxies). Taking into account the observations that suggest the presence of magnetic

fields in AGB stars (§2.2.1 above), I conclude that the strong convective motion in AGB stars together with the rotation can indeed amplify the magnetic field via an $\alpha^2\omega$ dynamo.

In previous papers I argued that this $\alpha^2\omega$ dynamo can operate, although at a low activity level, even in AGB stars rotating as slowly as $\omega \simeq 10^{-4}\omega_{\text{Kep}}$ (Soker 1998), and in some cases even as low as $\omega \simeq 3 \times 10^{-5}\omega_{\text{Kep}}$ (Soker & Harpaz 2000). We note that with this angular velocity the mass loss time scale $\tau_m = M_{\text{env}}/|\dot{M}_{\text{env}}|$, where M_{env} is the envelope mass, is not much shorter than $1/\omega$. Substituting typical values for AGB stars which are expected to be the progenitors of elliptical PNs, during their super-wind phase

$$\frac{\omega^{-1}}{\tau_m} = 1.6 \left(\frac{\omega}{10^{-4}\omega_{\text{Kep}}} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{P_{\text{Kep}}}{1 \text{ yr}} \right) \left(\frac{M_{\text{env}}}{0.03M_{\odot}} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{|\dot{M}_{\text{env}}|}{3 \times 10^{-5}M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}} \right). \quad (5)$$

This supports the assumption that the angular velocity plays a nonnegligible role in the $\alpha^2\omega$ dynamo even in these very slowly rotating AGB stars. However, the magnetic activity is expected to be weak, and the magnetic cool spots to be concentrated in and near the equatorial plane (see §2.2.1 above). In these stars, contrary to the case with the stars discussed in the present paper, the rotation is too slow to excite magnetic activity close to the poles, hence a higher mass loss rate near the equatorial plane leads later to the formation of an elliptical PN.

4. SUMMARY

In this paper I propose that the concentric semi-periodic shells found around several PNs, proto-PNs, and AGB stars are formed by a magnetic activity cycle in upper AGB stars. The main assumptions, processes and implications of the proposed mechanism for the formation of the shells are listed below, together with the explanations for the shells' properties listed in section 1.

(1) It is assumed that the magnetic activity leads to the formation of a large number of magnetic cool spots. The cool spots enhance dust formation (Soker 2000 and references therein), and hence increase the mass loss rate. The magnetic field, though, has no dynamical effects; its only role is to form cool spots. The formation of dust above cool spots is a highly nonlinear process (Soker 2000), and therefore a relatively small increase in the number of cool spots will substantially increase the mass loss rate. This explains the observations that the shells are much denser than the inter-shells density, by up to a factor of ~ 10 .

(2) The sporadic nature of the appearance of magnetic cool spots on the stellar surface, as in the sun, explains the incompleteness of some shells and other small-scale shell inhomogeneities.

(3) The spherical shells mean that the magnetic cool spots are distributed uniformly over the entire AGB stellar surface (up to the inhomogeneities mentioned above). This is indeed expected for strong magnetic activity (§2.2.1).

(4) The strong magnetic activity implies that AGB stars which form concentric shells are relatively

fast rotators, $0.01 \lesssim (\omega/\omega_{\text{Kep}}) \lesssim 0.1$. They are spun up by a stellar companion via tidal interaction, or via a common envelope phase. Such tidal interactions are likely to form bipolar PNs (Soker & Rappaport 2000), whereas a common envelope interaction is likely to form an extreme elliptical PNs. This explains why the shells are found in bipolar or extreme elliptical PNs and proto-PNs. Two things should be noted here: (i) The AGB stars cannot rotate too fast since then the centrifugal force will become nonnegligible and the shells will not be spherical. It is indeed expected that $\omega < 0.3\omega_{\text{Kep}}$ in most progenitors of bipolar PNs (Soker & Rappaport 2000). The companion cannot blow a collimated fast wind, or jets, during the phase of the shell formation. This constraints the companion to be a main sequence, rather than a white dwarf, and of relatively low mass $M_2 \sim 0.1 - 0.5M_{\odot}$. (ii) In very slowly rotating AGB stars the magnetic activity is very weak, the cycle period is extremely long, and the cool spots are expected to be concentrated near the equator (see §2.2.1), hence leading to the formation of elliptical PNs (Soker 1998, 2000).

(5) It is also assumed that, as in the sun and other main sequence stars, the magnetic activity has a semi-periodic variation. This is the explanation for the semi-periodic nature of the shells. In main sequence stars the ratio of the period of the magnetic activity cycle P_{cyc} to the rotation period is (Baliunas *et al.* 1996; Saar & Brandenburg 1999) $50 \lesssim P_{\text{cyc}}/P_{\text{rot}} \lesssim 10^5$. Therefore, for an AGB stellar rotation period of $\sim 10 - 100$ yrs, magnetic activity cycles of periods of $200 - 10^3$ yrs require this ratio to be somewhat smaller $P_{\text{cyc}}/P_{\text{rot}} \sim 10$.

(6) There is no dynamo model for AGB stars. Based on some observations listed in §2.2.1, I assume that a dynamo can indeed amplify magnetic fields in AGB stars. In the present paper I did not develop or calculate any dynamo mechanism for AGB stars. I only point here (§3) to the two major differences between the standard $\alpha\omega$ dynamo mechanism for main sequence stars and any dynamo mechanism for AGB stars. First, the high mass loss rate means that the wind drags the magnetic field lines in AGB stars, contrary to the case with main sequence stars. This suggests that the azimuthal shear near the surface plays a role in the dynamo mechanism, as well as the shear in the stellar interior. Second, the dynamo number is $N_D \ll 1$ (or the Rossby number is $\text{Ro} \gg 1$) in AGB stars, whereas the standard $\alpha\omega$ dynamo mechanism requires $N_D > 1$, as is the case with active main sequence stars. This suggests that the main amplification of magnetic fields in AGB stars is via the convective motion, but with a nonnegligible role of the rotation, i.e., an $\alpha^2\omega$ dynamo.

(7) This mechanism proposed in the present paper has some predictions. (i) It predicts that the AGB progenitors of the concentric semi-periodic shells have main sequence companions of mass $\sim 0.1 - 0.5M_{\odot}$, with orbital periods in the rang of $\sim 15 - 150$ yrs. The orbital periods predicted by the binary models mentioned in §2.1, on the other hand, are in the range of $\sim 200 - 10^3$ yrs. (ii) The proposed mechanism predicts that almost all PNs and proto-PNs with concentric semi-periodic shells are bipolar or extreme elliptical PNs. (iii) In some case the shells can be formed after the mass losing star was spun up via a common envelope evolution. In these cases most of the descendant PNs are expected to be extreme elliptical PNs, rather than bipolar PNs, and either the companion has a final orbital period of less than a year, even only a few hours, or else the companion is completely destructed in the common envelope.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: I thank Raghvendra Sahai for very helpful comments. This research was supported in part by grants from the Israel Science Foundations and the US-Israel Binational Science Foundation.

REFERENCES

- Baliunas, S. L., Nesme-Ribes, E. Sokoloff, D., & Soon, W. H. 1996, ApJ, 460, 848.
- Bond, H. 2000, in Asymmetrical Planetary Nebulae II: From Origins to Microstructures, eds. J. Kastner, S. Rappaport, and N. Soker, ASP Conference Series, in press (astro-ph/9909516).
- Charbonneau, P., Tomczyk, S., Schou, J., & Thompson, M. J. 1998, ApJ, 496, 1015.
- Deguchi, S. 1997, in Planetary Nebulae, IAU Symp. 180, eds. H. J. Habing & H. J. G. L. M. Lamers (Dordrecht: Kluwer), p. 151.
- Frank, A. 1995, AJ, 110, 2457
- Goldman, I., & Rephaeli, Y. 1991, ApJ, 380, 344.
- Harpaz, A., Rappaport, S., & Soker, N. 1997, ApJ, 487, 809.
- Hünsch, M., Schmitt, J. H. M. M., Schröder, K.-P., & Zickgraf, F.-J 1998, A&A, 330, 225
- Icke, V., Frank, A., & Heske, A. 1992, A&A, 258, 341.
- Kemball, A. J., & Diamond, P. J. 1997, ApJ, 481, L111
- Kwok, S., Su, K. Y. L., & Hrivnak, B. J. 1998, ApJ, 501, L117.
- Mastrodemos, N., & Morris, M. 1999, ApJ, 523, 357.
- Mastrodemos, N., Morris, M., & Castor, J. 1996, ApJ, 468, 851.
- Mauron, N., & Huggins, P. J. 1999, A&A, 349, 203.
- Morris, M., 1992, in Mass Loss on the AGB and Beyond, ed. Ho. Schwarz (ESO; Garching), p. 60.
- Noyes, R. W., Hartmann, L. W., Baliunas, S. L., Duncan, D. K., & Vaughan, A. H. 1984, ApJ, 279, 763.
- Priest, E. R. 1987, Solar Magnetohydrodynamics, (D. Reidel. Pub., Dordrecht).
- Saar, S. H., & Brandenburg, A. 1999, ApJ, 524, 295.
- Sahai, R., *et al.* 1998, ApJ, 493, 301.
- Sahai, R., Zijlstra, A., Bujarrabal, V., & Te Lintle Hekkert, P. 1999, AJ, 117, 1408.
- Soker, N. 1997, ApJSupp., 112, 487.
- Soker, N. 1998, MNRAS, 299, 1242 (astro-ph/9808289).
- Soker, N. 2000, MNRAS, in press (astro-ph/9908320).
- Soker, N., & Clayton, G. C. 1999, MNRAS, 307, 993 (astro-ph/9812263).
- Soker, N., & Harpaz, A. 1999, MNRAS, in press (astro-ph/9907407).
- Soker, N., & Rappaport, S. 2000, preprint (astro-ph/9911140).
- Soker, N., Rappaport, S., & Harpaz, A. 1998, ApJ, 496, 842.

- Su, K. Y. L., Volk, K., Kwok, S., & Hrivnak, B. J. 1998, ApJ, 508, 744.
- Tomczyk, S., Schou, J., & Thompson, M. J. 1995, ApJ Lett., 448, L57.